UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Where Do You Get Your Opinions? - - - - - - - - *A. Powell Davies*

The Unitarian Position - - - - - - - - - - Edwin H. Wilson

Educational Therapy - - *Betty Hirsch*

Needed: An International Office for Education - - - - - *Carl Hermann Voss*

Western Unitarian Conference News

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 11

Chicago, January, 1945

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

A. Powell Davies: Minister of All Souls' Church, Washington, D. C.

Betty Hirsch: A German refugee now living in England, and well known there for her teaching of the blind.

Robert S. Hoagland: Minister of the Unitarian Society of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Harry Taylor: Minister of the Grace Community Congregational Church, Jennings Lodge, Oregon.

Carl Hermann Voss: Extension Secretary of the Church Peace Union and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, New York City.

Edwin H. Wilson: Minister of All Souls' Church, First Unitarian Society of Schenectady, New York.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Dumbarton Oaks—CURTIS W. REESE 163

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 164

Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 166

ARTICLES—

Where Do You Get Your Opinions?—A. POWELL DAVIES 167

The Unitarian Position—EDWIN H. WILSON 170

Educational Therapy—BETTY HIRSCH 172

Needed: An International Office for Education—CARL HERMANN VOSS 174

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Better World—ROBERT S. HOAGLAND 175

A Significant Work—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 175

Original Style—HARRY TAYLOR 175

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE NEWS 176

THE FIELD—

Worldover Press 162

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Worldover Press

Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, expert on inter-American affairs, author of many volumes on Latin America, and former professor at Yale University, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania, has become President of Worldover Press, independent agency specializing in international news and located in Wilton, Connecticut, a suburb of N. Y. City. Devere Allen, founder of Worldover Press, author, former European correspondent and lecturer on international relations, will continue as Director of the agency. Clarence E. Pickett, Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee and authority on relief and reconstruction, will be Vice President. Professor Albert Sprague Coolidge, Harvard University scientist, will serve as Treasurer. E. Dixwell Chase, former Managing Editor of Worldover Press, now with the Associated Press, will be Secretary.

Dr. Philip H. Gray, Jr., formerly Assistant Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin, has joined the staff of Worldover Press as Executive Editor, and in addition to his other editorial responsibilities will edit a regular column of books devoted exclusively to international affairs. Marie H. Allen, who for several years has been co-editor, specializing in Latin American news, will continue as Associate Editor. Richard A. Kendrick, formerly of the United Press, will be Managing Editor of Worldover Press under the new setup.

Associated with the new corporation and its officers, will be a group of corporation members of recognized experience in public affairs. The group will include: Dr. Alex M. Burgess, of Brown University, leading Rhode Island physician; Prof. Richard M. Cameron, Boston School of Theology; Margaret S. Campbell, Pittsburgh inter-racial worker; Rabbi J. X. Cohen, Free Synagogue, New York; Charles P. Jervey, Hartford business research expert.

Also Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, of the Episcopal Church; Mrs. Seth M. Milliken, founder of the Public Action Committee; Ray Newton, executive leader, American Friends Service Committee; Lt. Sherman Pratt, Department of Public Relations, U. S. Navy; Dr. Karl W. H. Scholz, Wharton School of Commerce and Finance, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. George Clapp Vaillant, curator, University of Pennsylvania Museum, recently Technical Adviser to the U. S. Embassy in Peru.

The officers of the new corporation announced:

> We shall continue to maintain our Latin American Office in Mexico, and shall look forward to the re-establishment, after the end of the war in Europe, of the European Office which was directed at Brussels by Devere and Marie Allen until the invasion of the Low Countries in 1940. . . . . .

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXX JANUARY, 1945 No. 11

DUMBARTON OAKS

One of the gravest sins is to allow the ideal good to stand in the way of the possible good. There is, of course, hazard in working for the possible good as contrasted with the ideal good. There are degrees of possible good and we should not concede too much in deciding what are the limits of the possible. But after all proper caution is provided for, and after due weight is given to the power of the ideal to expand the limits of the possible, there comes a time when the choice must be made between advocacy of a really possible good and advocacy of a more ideal good. At such a time the good realist must part company with the uncompromising idealist. In Dumbarton Oaks we confront such a situation. Dumbarton Oaks is admittedly far from ideal. It may be that the proposals submitted by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference for the establishment of a general international organization can yet be improved before the final draft of a treaty is submitted to the several governments. But even in its final form it will not be ideal. The real issue to be decided is not whether Dumbarton Oaks is too far from the ideal, but whether it is near enough to the possible. On this issue it is my opinion that Dumbarton Oaks is within the realm of the possible, and that it should receive the support of all who want to make progress toward peace in our time. But already there can be seen in America the beginnings of hostile opinion similar to that which defeated the League of Nations. Bad men are again using good men's arguments. And if this hostile opinion triumphs and if a United Nations organization does not come into being, the way will be open for World War III. We must not allow Dumbarton Oaks to be defeated by a combination of unrealistic good men and realistic bad men. The choice is between the realistic possible and the unrealistic ideal. I choose the former.

Curtis W. Reese

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

President Roosevelt's entrance this month upon a fourth presidential term is a momentous event—momentous alike for this country and for the world. As he takes the solemn oath of office, a whole nation will wish him well, for on his record in these next four years depends his place in history, and the destiny for generations to come of American life. Mr. Roosevelt's power is simply enormous. For four successive elections he has held the unshaken support of the American people—an achievement unprecedented in our history. He speaks and acts with an authority rooted in the trust, admiration and devotion of the millions who have placed the government of this nation in his hands. To this must be added the experience of his long years of service, the mounting prestige rolled up from one term of office to another, and his acquaintanceship and influence with heads of states the world around. But with power goes responsibility. This is the Rooseveltian epoch, and what comes out of it will stand forever to the credit or discredit of the President in Washington. Victory in this great war is already assured. In former ages this was sufficient glory for a lustrous immortality—but not in this age! Our question now is not with victory itself, but with what is done with victory. Is this war, triumphantly fought on every front, going to lead to another unsatisfactory peace, another period of international discord and disorder, and at last another war? Then will Mr. Roosevelt and those associated with him never be forgiven. But suppose that this victorious war leads to a real international organization of mankind and a real enduring peace. Then will Mr. Roosevelt and those associated with him take such a place in the honor of men's hearts as has no parallel in history. The President is playing for enormous stakes! It is a good augury that his policies in the actual conduct of the war seem to have been uniformly definite and successful. It is my belief that Mr. Roosevelt's share in the winning of the war is very great indeed, and will be so rated in the future. In the matter of the peace, however, there are terribly disquieting signs. Before the fighting is done, the Allied powers seem to be running away with the President, just as they ran away with Woodrow Wilson in the last war after the fighting was done. Poland, Finland, the Baltic states, Jugoslavia, Italy, Greece—these are chapters in what is increasingly appearing to be a tragic tale. The next four years are likely to be a kind of last chance for the human race, or at least for our Western world. If ever we should pray that a man may be God-guided, God-strengthened, and God-justified, it is now for Mr. Roosevelt on this occasion of his fourth inauguration as President of the United States.

II

With Thanksgiving and Christmas gone, and New Year's come, there remains the long hard drag of the winter on before. And it looks as though it would really be a drag, on the military front as everywhere else. This German resistance to the overwhelming superiority of Allied arms is really an appalling thing. Does it mean that we have got to smash up everything that lies in our path as a condition of advancing at all? Monte Cassino and Aachen showed what could be done by a defending force, and the utter ruin left behind demonstrates the cost of victory. Which raises a momentous question! Assuming, as we must, that the Germans are willing to destroy Europe, should we be willing also? If it is fanatical for the Germans to bring down the whole temple of civilization upon their heads, why is it not equally fanatical for us to join in doing the same? We are told that Aachen was not destroyed until every effort had been made to persuade the Nazi garrison to surrender the place intact. Failing in this, we let loose our guns and bombs, and levelled the town as flat as though we had done so in the beginning. And this is evidently going to be our policy of attack from now on—to smash all that stands in the way of our advance. But is this all that we can do? Is this the only way to win the victory? As a matter of fact, we have already won the victory. The Nazis know it as well as we do. Why should we not, therefore, use our victory to secure peace? Why should we not have peace now, on terms that will give us everything that we are really fighting for—the liberation of occupied territory, the release of the Jews from massacre, the return of art treasures, loot and enslaved populations, and the end of Nazi rule? Of course, these terms do not include "unconditional surrender," and the dismemberment of German territory, and the dismantling of German industry. Our enemies will not be thrown under our iron heel, to be crushed like a writhing serpent. But is it worth-while to fight for these final aims of retaliation and revenge at the expense not merely of the continued destruction of continental Europe, but also of our own treasure and the lives of our precious boys? If we can have victory and peace now, why should we spend another million lives and incalculable money, just for the satisfaction of marching through a desert to Berlin? The time is right at hand when we should consider if the war should go on another hour. Our own conviction is that to continue it an unnecessary split second is a crime.

III

Who are the "peace-loving peoples" of the world? asks *World Events*. There is great talk about these peoples today, especially since the Dumbarton Oaks conference. It was the "peace-loving peoples" who sat down together at this conference, and the "peace-loving peoples" who are going to be allowed to enter the new international organization contemplated by this conference. But what is the record of history? Are *we* the "peace-loving peoples"—America, Britain, Soviet Russia—who are now engaged in fashioning the world after our own image? In Professor Quincy Wright's recent book, *A Study of War,* covering the years 1480-1941, there is a list of the wars fought during this period, and the nations participating:

	Wars		Wars
Great Britain	78	Italy	25
France	71	Holland	23
Spain	64	Germany	23
Russia	61	Denmark	20
Austria	52	China	11
Turkey	43	Japan	9
Sweden	26		

Professor Wright credits the United States with thirteen wars in one hundred and fifty years, not including Indian wars. This is the record of modern history, and it shows Britain and France at the top of the list of warmakers, and Germany and Japan near the bottom. But perhaps it is recent times only that are being considered in this present classification of the United Nations as the "peace-loving peoples." But what are these peoples doing, or preparing to do after this war? Great Britain has completed plans for compulsory military training after the war of all boys over fourteen years of age, with a year of regular military service after reaching eighteen. China has announced her intention to have "an army of the very first order, supported by an air force." Soviet Russia has the greatest army in the world, supported by a system of universal military training. America is boasting of a "fleet now greater than all the navies of the world put together," to quote the words of our President, and is preparing to enact by law a system of military training for all boys over seventeen years. For the first time in our history we are to join European countries in adopting universal conscription. Does all this sound "peace-loving"? Is this the way we prepare for the peace we are said now to be planning? The test of peace, to our way of thinking, is disarmament. We are going to disarm Germany and Japan after this war is done, and that is all to the good. But why should we not similarly disarm ourselves? Why not act as though we really loved peace, and were planning and expecting to get it? Why fiddle and fool with a question which involves the very life of humankind?

IV

Goebbels is devilishly clever. What do you suppose he is doing now? Taking Allied flyers, downed by the Nazis, and conducting them on tours of the cities they have bombed, with the idea of stirring up a guilt complex within them! The idea is effective, declares Brig. John Rawlings Rees, reporting on this latest exploit of the Nazi Propaganda Minister. And why should it not be? I like to think that our fine boys still have conscience alive within them, and therefore would be stricken with dismay when confronted with the ruin and death which war has made them perpetrate. This experience might make them so hate war, and all the fiendish system of preparation for war, that they would highly resolve never to have part in it again. Of course, it is this very thing that military training is supposed, and indeed intended, to eradicate forever from the soul. Brigadier Rees' testimony on this point is interesting. The soldier, he says, "has always been taught to control [his aggressive] tendencies, but now they must be used. The soldier needs a philosophy if he is not to find undue strain from having to kill, and something like a concept of 'surgical' killing, or the idea of a 'police war,' is essential if men are to have peace of mind and a clear conscience after their war experiences." Incidentally, this is the first time I ever heard of "surgical killing." What is such killing—and what is police *war?* But the purport of this statement is plain. The soldier, the bomber, must be "toughened," as Brigadier Rees himself puts it, that he may without compunction be a killer. But the conscience lives—it cannot be blotted out or paralyzed—and the killer has but to see the work of his hands to be appalled. Which is just the way, perhaps, to end war! Why should we not do to the German flyers and mechanicians what Goebbels, according to this report, is doing to our men? Let them see with their own eyes Coventry and Rotterdam and Lidice. Let them witness London as ripped and torn by the robot bombs or the V-2 rockets! Are the Germans impervious to the spectacle of these horrors? Has their training conditioned them into utter beasts? Perhaps! But if so, they must be unconditioned, and what surer way is there than this? To face the hideous reality of war—to be made to see exactly what is being done—this surely is one cure of this dreadful business. Goebbels, with his diabolical ingenuity, was trying to soften up our fliers and thus weaken our offensive. But perhaps he has hit upon something that his black soul never imagined—that man can be brought to himself, be made to see and to abhor his guilt, and therewith put it away from him forever.

V

The attack of the Roman Catholic bishops on the conclusions of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference should not be forgotten in lapse of time. With the precision of trained logicians these powerful clerics point the utter absurdity of the two provisions—one, that action of the

Council against a so-called "aggressor" nation be rendered effective only by unanimous vote, and two, that, as Russia insists, a nation be allowed to sit in and vote in a case involving a charge that it is an aggressor. This latter proposal, if finally adopted—and how can it be rejected in the face of Russia's stand?—will of course nullify the whole scheme for the prevention of an attack by any nation upon the peace of the world. For where is aggression going to come from after this war, with Germany and Japan stripped of power, if not from Russia, or Britain, or America—one of the three great military powers still left in the world? And how is that aggression going to be met by any concerted action, if such action must be unanimous, and can be rendered null and void by the refusal of the guilty power to condemn itself? The Catholic bishops are no fools; they sincerely want peace; and they know that this is the precise way not to get it. My own objection to the program of Dumbarton Oaks, of course, goes much deeper than this. It is my fixed conviction that no peace can ever be brought into this world by resort to force. It is war that uses force—and even the use of force for peace purposes is nonetheless still war. The problem of peace is the problem not of using force but of getting rid of it—not of defining conditions under which it can legally and justifiably be used, but of creating conditions under which it will not have to be used at all. I regard the whole Dumbarton Oaks program, therefore, as vitiated from the start. It is a new imperialism, based upon the old concept of military power, and that means war and not peace. But it is a healthy thing to see that even those who do not go to these pacifist extremes at all, still discern the essential sham of the whole Dumbarton Oaks proposal. The Catholic bishops have in this sense done us a priceless service. They have, on the one hand, led the way for the churches in speaking out on this subject. Then, on the other hand, these churchmen, like a surgeon with his scalpel, have laid bare the heart of the "Dumbarton Hoax" as it stands today. Let us not deceive ourselves that this conference has taken us anywhere. The work of peace after this war has still to be done, and we look forlornly for those who are prepared to do it.

VI

As compared with the Catholic bishops, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America made a poor showing at its biennial conference at Pittsburgh. Its pronunciamento on the Dumbarton Oaks business, for example, had none of the searching and forthright character of the bishops'. Where the latter made perfectly plain the inadequacy and even menace of the Dumbarton agreement, the former retreated into confusion of "on the one hand" and "on the other hand" which were fatal to clarity. The Federal Council avoided the central issues, and ended by giving a shilly-shally endorsement of what obviously it did not like. The same thing seems to be true of the report on the churches in their relation to war. I have not read the text of this report, but the news despatches all indicate that the Council was badly split, and gave no clear guidance as to what to do with Christianity in wartime. This is not leadership, especially in such a time of confusion and dismay as this. As for the rest of the proceedings, I am chiefly moved by the refusal of fellowship to the Universalists, for which action I find words inadequate to express the full measure of my indignation. What is there in our Universalist friends to disqualify them for membership in a body of Christians? What is the test of Christianity, anyhow? The antediluvian theology of some obscure orthodox sect which knows as little of modern thought in the religious as in the scientific field? Dogmas out of the Dark Ages which Jesus himself would never recognize? Straight from Paul through Augustine to Calvin runs the superstition of faith *about* Jesus and his nature as contrasted with the true religion of faith *in* Jesus and his teachings —and this superstition is still dominating the religion of those who profess to be the followers of the Nazarene. Would he who said, "Ye are my disciples if ye have love one for another"—would *he* shut out the Universalists from his church? To ask the question is to answer it. The Federal Council should be ashamed of itself! Two things served to redeem this biennial session: these were the resolution in opposition to post-war military conscription, and the election as chairman of Bishop Oxnam, of the Methodist Church. Bishop Oxnam is able, brave, and liberal. Perhaps he will restore to the Council the leadership it has so sadly forfeited by this latest exhibition of ecclesiastical timidity.

Jottings

The National Board of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., has petitioned President Roosevelt and the heads of other United Nations "to join in creating a long era of peace . . . to strive for a peace without pacifism."

"Peace without pacifism!" That sounds like bricks without straw.

What was prophesied a long time ago—that this war would end, only to be followed by widespread civil wars —is now coming terribly true in Europe. And wait until the Asiatic war is done, and then see what happens in China, India, and Burma!

There is only one sound rule of life for these dire days—and that is to live one day at a time. This will answer conclusively, for example, the torturing question as to when this war is going to end. It has *not* ended today! What more do we need to know?

Steadily through the years, Henry Wallace has grown in stature, character, and courageous leadership. Now that Wendell Willkie is dead, who is there to compare with Mr. Wallace as our great American statesman?

When I get tired of ceaseless Protestant attacks upon Catholics, I recall two great sayings by two great popes:

Pius XI—"Abraham is called our patriarch, our ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with the reality of this text. We are all Semites spiritually."

Pius XII—"Nothing, nothing is lost by peace. Everything may be lost by war."

Let Protestants match these sayings, or else be silent!

When Hitler came to power, he shocked the world by removing the names of Jewish soldiers from the war memorials of Germany. Now the Hood River (Oregon) Post of the American Legion has removed from its war memorial the names of sixteen Japanese-American soldiers who have served honorably in this war. Thus do we ourselves catch the dread Nazi infection!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Where Do You Get Your Opinions?

A. POWELL DAVIES

According to Voltaire, opinion has caused "more trouble on this little earth than plagues or earthquakes." Doubtless it has, for who could estimate how many wars and revolutions, how many massacres and martyrdoms have come about through conflicts of opinion? It is because of this that many persons prominent in history, both ancient and modern, have thought it wise from time to time to limit freedom of opinion. If men can think as they like, they have said, then we must expect them after a while to act as they like, and inasmuch as they will think differently, they will act diversely, and this will bring them into opposition with each other, thereby producing the evils and disasters that it always has. Let us therefore require that all men shall subscribe to approximately the same opinions.

But when they have tried to bring this about, instead of improving the situation they have made it worse. In the first place, the attempt to restrict opinion has needed to be backed by force. The State or the Church or the institution concerned became itself oppressive and thus produced the very evils it intended to prevent. By this means came star chambers, inquisitions, book burnings, and martyrdoms. The harsher the measures used, the stronger the resistance impounded, and sooner or later rebellion broke loose and the experiment was over. In the second place, the restriction of opinion must itself be based upon opinion. The dominant power, whatever it is, represses other opinions in favor of its own. This it is bound to do, once the restriction is decided upon, for opinion of some kind cannot be avoided. It is the necessary basis for a policy. As there is no way, however, of keeping people persuaded that the opinion of the dominant power is the right one, resistance is inevitable. Moreover, no matter what is done to fend them off, new opinions are sure to form. Different minds, facing the same circumstances, will arrive at divergent views. This happens even though the minds in question have been moulded by the same general environment. And new opinions at once begin to clamor to be heard.

Ways have been tried, of course, to meet these difficulties. Churches have declared that their opinions are authoritative and final because they come from God. Dreadful punishments have been meted out in this life and even worse miseries promised in an afterlife to all who dared to challenge this authority. Probably this has been the most successful device that has yet been tried for limiting differences of opinion. Nevertheless, it has not in the end succeeded. Heretical opinions have always arisen and have promptly fortified themselves by claiming the same authority: they, too, have come from God. In fact, when all the opinions which are said to be held by God are added together, God becomes the contradictory source of indescribable confusion.

To avoid the distressing consequences of this confusion as well as to liberate opinion for creative ends, the Church and State were separated in this and other countries and freedom of opinion was established by law. Not only freedom of religious opinion but of all opinion was guaranteed. The State would not prescribe beliefs—in anything—nor yet proscribe them. Whatever this might do or fail to do towards the fostering of improved opinions, at least it was hoped that conflict would be thenceforth limited to peaceful methods—as in the main it was. Trouble was not entirely avoided—there was even a difference of opinion within the United States which led to civil war—but still it was a better basis than anything that had previously been tried.

In addition, the State recognized that intellectual freedom is a natural right. Where minds were not free, they struggled to be free; they always had. It was inherent in their nature so to do. Only to the extent that minds were free could the world of facts be reliably interpreted. A mind that could not say what it saw and understood but only what it was supposed to see and understand could not add anything dependable to knowledge. Sound reasoning required free minds, science was impossible without this freedom, and in the same way only freedom of opinion could keep the door open to any genuine growth of truth.

When, however, the opposition of opinions caused

confusion, and in political affairs a stalemate, people like Doctor Goebbels in Germany returned once more to the old persuasion that freedom had to be restricted. It was necessary, he said, to impose opinion and require acceptance of it. To help him in the task, he thought he had a new device. We shall not merely tell people what their opinions will have to be, he said, but we shall mould those opinions actively through complete control of highly potent, modern methods of propaganda. He tried it. For a while his success seemed noteworthy. But today we know that he has failed. He tried to mould opinion against the facts and the facts proved stronger; and he violated the conscience of mankind and conscience proved stronger. Thus he brought upon himself an everwidening condemnation. We know also that even his transient success was not entirely due to his methods. The opinion he wanted to disseminate was the opinion people were willing to receive—a sufficient number of them. Even tyrants cannot altogether do without the support of public opinion, and the inner core of that opinion is the people's own desire and preference. When we recollect the events of the past few years we may therefore say again and with new confidence that freedom of opinion is the only hopeful basis. Those who would destroy it or restrict it, if we let them have their way, can only cause disasters. We must stick to freedom, knowing that whatever freedom costs it will be better in the end to pay.

Just the same we shall delude ourselves if we suppose that this concludes the matter. We must go on to recognize that now, as always, the best protection freedom has is in the use we make of it. Free opinions will not save us from misfortune if they are bad opinions. If a free mind is lazy or succumbs to prejudice it brings about its own enslavement. If it is merely passive and submissive it invites betrayal. From this will come not only degradation but the factors that produce disasters.

There are always people waiting to persuade us to a false opinion. Some of these people are calculated schemers, deliberate in their intentions; others are just enamoured of their own conceit. Still others contribute to opinion-forming by a sort of accident. In the social make-up of the world we live in, they occupy, by chance, a place of influence. Everyone should therefore ask himself from time to time, and the oftener the better: Where do I get my opinions? Do I form them myself? If I think I do, what do I form them from? Do I ever revise them? If so, on what basis? Is there a pattern to the way that my opinions come and go? Is there a consistent thread that runs through all of them? If I believe there is, what is it? Not what do I like to think it is, but what is it really? Where do I get my opinions?

It is interesting to reflect that a generation or so ago, many people would have said that they got at least the basis upon which they formed opinions from the Bible. They used its contents—or thought they did—as the touchstone by which to test both their general views and their particular opinions. Unfortunately for this purpose, the Bible is rather a large book and represents a great variety of attitudes—which is natural since it was written by a great many different people over a long period of time—and so it can have profuse varieties of interpretations. A man can show from the Bible that he ought to be a nationalist or an internationalist, a lover of his enemies or one who hates them, a believer in slavery or an advocate of universal liberty, the husband of one wife or a polygamist, a free enterpriser or a Communist—and almost anything else we might suggest. The strong thread of consistency that can be made to run through the Bible is provided by the particular interpretation which a church or a society decides to give it. This is proved by the great variety of differing denominations, cults, and sects, all of which regard themselves as the true believers in the Bible.

It is, in short, a present attitude—or the living conscience—that provides the basis and it always was. It carries to the Bible the outlook that it wants to deduce from it and makes its selections and exegesis accordingly.

But, today, there is little likelihood of many people in the more influential part of modern civilization relying for the basis of their opinions upon the Bible. There is, however, another book that a lot of people get their opinions from—their pocketbook. In the most extraordinary way, they discover that almost everything is right that the pocketbook approves and almost nothing is right that injures the pocketbook. If people are half-starved somewhere and something is proposed that goes against the pocketbook, then it is promptly discovered that natural law is what is starving these people, and everything is somehow wrong that might cost something to feed them. This is not always so upon the surface. People are often generous when they are allowed to open their own pocketbook but highly resistant when the government wants to open it. Yet effective correction of social and economic injustices can only be brought about in the end through some kind of government action. When it comes to debating what kind of government action it ought to be, there is certainly room for difference of opinion. But unless it is individual selfishness that should control opinions—and carried far enough, this would mean chaos—the answer should never be based on concern for the inviolability of our pocketbooks. Of course, we always say that it is not. We manufacture high-sounding political principles to protect us from the truth. But the truth remains just the same: and in the long run, it manifests itself.

It even manifests itself in the pocketbook. Because we are not willing for something that costs comparatively little, we eventually have to take something that costs much more. For instance, because we were not willing to lose the little that it might have cost to cooperate with the rest of the world before the war—in such things as enforcing peace and in economic matters like lowering tariffs and helping other nations to a higher standard of living—we are paying in the end what it costs to run a war—and the cost is rising ruinously with every conflict.

It is good sense as well as good religion to refuse to base your opinions on your pocketbook. There are other books, not so easy or so pleasant to read but very important for those who want to deal with facts, who want to understand realities, and who recognize that facts and realities are inexorable in the end. For instance, there is the whole book of human misery written every day—man-caused misery, economic and political injustice, social wrong and deprivation. Parts of this book are found in print and may be read in libraries but much more of it is visible all around us in the book of life itself.

A source of many of our opinions, perhaps of most, is the little noticed but altogether potent and continu-

ous influence of the social group we live within. This acts very largely through the elaboration and reinforcement of common prejudices. We do not recognize foolish ideas when they are fashionable and if all our friends reflect them. Sydney Smith, the famous English preacher who died in 1845, once suggested that there ought to be devised an instrument for testing foolishness. He thought it might be called a "foolometer." He did not succeed in inventing a mechanical one but he recommended that every responsible person should make the acquaintance of three or four "regular British fools as a test of public opinion." He thought that if people heard complete fools tell them what partial fools so often do, they might recognize it as folly and resist it.

If Sydney Smith had been a modern American, he would probably have varied his suggestion to the effect that each of us should try to cultivate two or three "stuffed shirts." Warned by their pompous inanities and dogmatic vacuities we would be alert and protected when more intelligent people were expressing more persuasively the same opinions. The more I have thought of this idea, the more I have admired it. It is not entirely charitable, it is true, but it *is* useful. Moreover, it is completely feasible. The raw material is so abundant.

Where do we get our opinions? From the newspapers?—Which newspapers? The same ones every day? From the columnists?—Which columnists? And why do we think they are right? From the magazines? From the digests?—How do we know that we are not being imposed upon? How can we be certain that we are not the victims of a definite policy designed to undermine our independent judgment?

But, you say, we cannot discover all the facts for ourselves. We cannot interpret everything that happens or is alleged to happen. The world is a large place and a great deal is going on in it. Who can cover all the possibilities of error?

You are entirely right. You cannot build up all the substance of your own opinions from your own resources. You can and should make every effort to arrive at facts in matters of supreme importance. You can and should resist the headlines and the fashionable fads and prejudices. You can and should suspect your own desires and inclinations. But even when you have tried to do all this, even if you have made a salutary habit of it, there remain the influences and moulding forces that you cannot stop to analyze. You must often be affected, and considerably, by the opinions of other people. What can you do?

This you can be sure of: you can do a great deal more than you are doing now. You can read the viewpoints that you do not agree with. Only immature minds refuse to try to understand opinions that they do not like. You can stretch your imagination and put yourself in the place of people with different attitudes from your present one. You can give a fact due weight whenever you find one. Measureless miseries are caused in this world because so few people are able to give a fact due weight when they find one. You can give up the vanity of wanting to be always of the same opinion. Those whose opinions never change are always wrong eventually. They are bound to be so because the world we live in is a world of changes. When circumstances change, they require an adaptation in opinions.

All this and a great deal more is entirely practical; it is part of what the liberal attitude to life demands. It increases control over our own lives and improves the soundness of our contribution to the world. It is indispensable to a hopeful future. Freedom of opinion is the only method possible for generating the ideas and purposes which can make the common lot a little happier and more secure in days ahead. But it is not self-activating, not automatic. Freedom is not only a privilege, it is a discipline—and a hard one. It must justify itself by liberating our minds to better opinions. Those who are free to form their own opinions—or to choose amongst the opinions offered to them—are free to give support to false opinions. But if they do, the penalty is swift and certain. Part of it is the likelihood of losing freedom. Nothing we can undertake is too much if it leads to alertness and independence of judgment and towards impartial and candid reckoning with truth.

Yet it remains the fact that we have need of something more. Whether we succeed considerably or only to a small degree in the disciplines I have indicated, we need a basis: something to stand upon. That, of course, is what neo-traditionalists are so eager to reemphasize, and naturally they offer to supply this basis. But what they offer is ineffectual. It would deceive us. Hitler also knew that people needed a basis for their judgment, and he, too, made every effort to provide it. It proved to be an evil thing. Let us make a more independent approach.

Freedom of opinion belongs by natural affinity with every other freedom; and all the freedoms, whether people are aware of it or not, derive from free religion. It is the free soul that nourishes the free mind and gives direction to the free man's life. And what is a free soul? We know what it is free from: free from superstition and prejudice, from blind beliefs and slavish and unreasonable worship. But what is it free *to?* It is free to love the truth more dearly than it loves anything less than truth; it is free to love the common welfare more than it loves the prosperity of favored individuals; it is free to put faithfulness ahead of fortune; it is free to love the brotherhood of man.

Free religion is deliverance not only from the bondage of error and false belief, but also from enslavement to selfish and unworthy aims. Its truth is to be found not only in its doctrine but in its purposes. It justifies the individual through the justice that he seeks throughout the world. There is no dividing of free religion so as to separate these things. An unjust man will have false opinions; a man who turns away from human brotherhood also turns his back on truth at last. The basis that we need is in this free religion. It is the surest test we have — a living and dynamic test — for truth and error, honesty and prejudice, in arriving at opinions. No claim is made that it will lead to easy certainties and swift infallibilities. When the pain goes out of thinking, the religion goes out, too. This is the *best* basis—not the *easiest* one.

Where do we get our opinions? We should get the basis of them in the living conscience that loves justice more than advantage and tempers its verdicts with compassion to all others but never to itself; in the free mind that fights unceasingly not only against intellectual error but against the treachery of hidden prejudice; in the loving heart that counts brotherhood greater than its own ease; and in the free soul that tolerates no screen of self-appeasement and asks no shelter from the light of truth and God.

The Unitarian Position

EDWIN H. WILSON

A few Unitarians in each of several cities have been visited by representatives of the Psychological Corporation of America. As a first step in Unitarian Advance —an effort of our national organization to determine the basis on which our various churches can advance together—the Unitarians visited were asked why they are Unitarians and what Unitarianism means to them. It was discovered that the central tenet in our position is the Free Mind Principle. Meeting subsequently, in various institutes across the land, our ministers have explored the query further. At Tarrytown it was found by the ministers that we are a church uniquely related to freedom; a church open-minded toward what at any time is modern; a church which puts its stress on service rather than dogma; and a church which is in a strategic position to develop a world-uniting faith at a time when humanity needs a way to transcend the differences of its creeds through the unity of ethical action.

At all times in their denominational history, Unitarians have been stimulated by two needs. On the one hand there has been their desire for a freedom that permits growth. On the other hand there has been the wish to affirm our faith in a positive manner. Out of the tension between these two we have achieved our progress. I have in my study a little booklet which lists the covenants that different Unitarian congregations have used as their bond of union. These statements express the position of local Unitarian churches at given times in their history. Some of these covenants have been widely used, such as the five points enumerated by James Freeman Clarke or the beautiful statement by James Vila Blake:

> Love is the spirit of this church
> And service is its law.
> This is our great covenant—
> To dwell together in peace,
> To seek the truth in love
> And to help one another.

Usually the records of each church show recurrent efforts over the years to sum up their views. And almost always the complete freedom of mind and conscience has been affirmed. The affirmations include an "escape clause" which guarantees that no formulation is final or dogmatic or binding on the individual member. This Free Mind Principle therefore assures us that in every decade new statements of the Unitarian position will be made. It enables us to grow from more to more. Unitarian Advance includes such an effort on a denomination-wide scope.

When we ask how the principle of religious liberty has actually worked in Unitarian history, we perceive its fruitfulness as a way of religious association. Certain Christians, largely in the New England Congregational churches, found themselves increasingly dissatisfied with their inherited Calvinism. The doctrine of a God who would send men and women to hell because they lacked the right faith, regardless of the life they lived; the miracles and myths of the Old and New Testaments; the gloomy otherworldliness; the beliefs in original sin and infant damnation of Calvinism—all these shocked both reason and moral conscience. Ministers began to preach more liberal doctrine. New influences in the latter part of the eighteenth century were penetrating the Christian consciousness. Out of the continental enlightenment came a rationalism that made reason supreme. New winds of democratic faith in the common man renewed in Christendom a spirit akin to that of the Jewish prophets and the concern of Jesus for the good life for human beings in the here and now. Science was prospering and was in time to achieve a vast prestige before which the old world view was to give way in thoughtful people. What orthodoxy encountered in this trend, as it will again and again, was a blending of the pioneer temperament, the democratic faith, and the scientific spirit.

In a famous sermon in 1819 at Baltimore, William Ellery Channing crystallized these trends, and the conservative minorities in many congregations departed, leaving the liberals fortunately situated with some of the finest old church properties. Bearing in mind Channing's warning that they should "shun sectarianism as they would shun hell" our churches to this day are not a sect, as are churches which carry along the excess baggage of an outworn creed as their purported basis of membership. We have no dogmatic beliefs embodying the dead thoughts of the past to impose upon our members. We hold that all creeds, as statements of required faith by which people are included or excluded in a church, are wrong. Inevitably a creed will become an obstacle to intellectual progress. Even to permit private interpretation of a creed, as some modernist churches do, encourages insincerity. Creeds cause churches to drift more and more out of the stream of life.

The early endeavor of Unitarians was to get back of the creeds that had been superimposed on the life of Jesus to what he actually taught. These early Unitarians rejected the miracles as out of accord with the known facts of life. Instead of regarding the Bible as an infallible source, they held it a man-made document bearing the marks of many editings. We must use our reason and moral sense to sift truth from error. We must "prove all things, hold fast to what is good" in the light of evidence and of the best morality we know. They found the Virgin Birth incredible, duplicated in other world religions, and declared that Jesus was a man born like other men. Thomas Jefferson, a Unitarian, clipped from the New Testament the words he thought most probably had been spoken by Jesus and found that a slender but precious morsel remained.

This process of criticism was not an essentially negative prodecure. Rather, it was similar to that which takes place when weeds are removed to permit useful plants to thrive. What was less than the best and what was unreasonable or out of accord with the tested knowledge of science was indeed rejected. But what was retained grew to greater importance in their lives. Holding fast to what is good meant to accept the moral influence of Jesus, to seek the truth as he sought it, to love men as he had loved them "even unto the least of them." Under his teaching that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath Jesus set the pattern of a humanism that makes any custom or belief holy according to its helpfulness in developing character. Jesus taught that the motives from which a man's action springs are the measure of his moral

worth, and from him Unitarians obtained a spiritual conception of the inner man.

This positive sifting of enduring values from the Bible was projected back into the Old Testament. All that was ethically inferior to the example of the best men of all times was rejected as unworthy, all that was out of accord with the advancing science of their day was left behind as the undeveloped world view of prescientific times. In the course of its history, Unitarianism found evolution a more reasonable statement of creation than the first chapter of Genesis: Unitarians were the first to accept Darwinism and its later developments. But an exalted social idealism was found in the record of the Old Testament prophets and this spirit has been kept. Micah had said: "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love kindness and to walk humbly with thy God." In time "the Lord" became largely synonymous with natural law. But the relationship between the laws of nature and human ethics—between "the starry vault above and the moral law within"—remains in Unitarian thinking today. The principles of justice, peace, and righteousness, the necessity of world brotherhood, are held not to be mere chance. There is a reason in the nature of things why indifference toward truth and the cruelty of the world's Hitlers toward the human individual and the peace of humanity are wrong; and why democratic concern for the common man and for world cooperation is right. The Hebrews had said righteousness and truth "spring out of the earth"; natural necessity is manifest in the need of man to live with his fellow man; it is projected in his idealism as the way that man must live, if he is to fulfill his highest possibilities.

Unitarians also have retained much of the beauty that is found in the scriptural passages which express this relatedness of man to his source and his goal of brotherhood on earth. Although controversy has sharpened our critical sense and made us desire new modes of worship in addition to the old, we have not allowed ourselves to be fettered with a literalism that cuts us off from the superb poetry that the Bible contains.

So our application of the Free Mind Principle has been a positive one. Fred G. Bratton, in *The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit,* shows that wherever in past centuries men have gone as seekers of the truth directly to the Scriptures, they have emerged with fresh and energizing ideals. They have found in Jesus a man who illustrates in many ways humankind at its best. Because he was human, and not a God descended to earth, we can hope to imitate him. What has resulted in modern Unitarianism from this search has been fruitful for better human living. It is apparently no accident that in the Hall of Fame and in *Who's Who* the number of Unitarians is out of proportion to the size of our denomination with a percentage above that of other religious groupings. We seem both to attract and to produce men and women of achievement and public spirit. Once the prophetic tradition and the ethics of Jesus were freed of the superstitions which belonged to the day in which they were set forth, once doctrinal accretions that were added after the death of Jesus were sloughed off, there appeared and flourished the enduring insight into the way of life that is necessary for man if he would reach his best selfhood. Once the orthodox creeds and clerical authority, especially the ideals of Biblical infallibility and human depravity, were rejected, men no longer believed that they are helpless, that they should not think for themselves, that this life need be a vale of tears, or that moral effort is useless. So we have turned from concern with another world to the quest for the life abundant in the world that now is.

The basis of their criticism of tradition also gave Unitarians a way to new truth and new moral example from other than Biblical sources. It was seen that where the ethics of the Bible was true, it was not true because it was in the Bible but because it was true in human experience. This has provided tools for sifting the Scriptures and experience of other times and places for religious truth. Channing declared this from the beginning. Emerson opened doors to truth from Hinduism. Unitarians have always sought emancipating truth wherever it has appeared. For them "revelation is not sealed."

More than a century of responsible thought has therefore meant progressive enrichment and increasingly sound foundations. Who builds on science and on love to man need not fear new revelations. Unitarians accepted the higher criticism of the Bible. They studied the world religions. They incorporated in their thinking new discoveries of science. They were the only religious organization to champion the cause of evolution at the Scopes trial in Dayton, Tennessee.

Unitarians have pondered the ideas of God and the problem of death and on these ultimates they give the widest freedom of belief because they are the imponderables of life. We do not make ultimates central in our fellowship. Generally speaking, from the time of Ralph Waldo Emerson on, God has been held among us to be the immanent creativity of nature. "Some call it evolution and others call it God." Always our fellowship has been hospitable to the reverent agnostic, but it has never isolated men from the universe. For Unitarians, God became a larger thought joining natural law and moral law in one emergence: the "life that maketh all things new" at work in the soul and idealism of men.

Similarly with respect to immortality. As an area of greatest speculation there has been the greatest freedom and the least dogmatism concerning life after death. Beliefs concerning death are for us an individual matter. Yet when we ask what the free mind has done with this problem, we are reassured of the value of religious freedom. For the chief thing we have done is to dispel the fear of death. Charles W. Eliot, noted educator, once said, "Unitarians die well!" It is a curious fact that we who are least certain concerning what actually happens to us when we die, face death most calmly; whereas those who think they can tell us precisely how the furniture in heaven is arranged, wail over their dead and take endless liturgical precautions to condition God to treat them mercifully. We deny to none the right to hope for more when this life is over. Many reasonable persons among us believe it not to be just or sensible that when a man's mind is most developed, his spirit most mature, he should be snuffed out. Others take comfort in the thought of everlasting rest and would be disconcerted to find that they would have to come to terms with an existence elsewhere.

Whatever else they believe concerning death, Unitarians generally hold to a belief in cultural immortality. They know that those who live a life of disinterested service, live for what will outlast them. The things to which they devote their days are like the best part of themselves and will not follow them into the

grave. Unitarians are content to live one life at a time, to pitch this life high, holding that, come what may, the best preparation for the end is to live this life as worthily as possible. Thus we can see that the Free Mind Principle, applied to theological tradition and human experience, has produced a confident method with which to face the way of all flesh.

Retaining what they held permanent in the Scriptures, Unitarians have claimed to be "Unitarian Christians." But Theodore Parker, and the Free Religious Association formed in his spirit to uphold religious liberty and promote cooperation with other liberal faiths —Christian and non-Christian—posed the question of whether Christianity is the last word in religion. The very logic of our position points to the emergence of a world-uniting religion which, catching up into itself what is universally true and enduringly right in Christianity and Judaism, draws wisdom from other sources. Such a universal faith would be available to all free minds. Even now there is no barrier to keep from membership in our churches those who depart from the Jewish orthodoxies, and in our churches are found many who have gravitated to our position from Judaism as naturally as do former adherents of Christian orthodoxy. We are more Christian than anything else, but in no exclusive sense. We would welcome an ex-Mohammedan or an ex-Hindu. Truth and love are valid in all places and times, and cannot be labeled as the exclusive property of any sect. So the free mind has carried and continues to carry us forward toward universal religion.

Wendell Willkie stated in our denominational paper, *The Christian Register* (June, 1943), that "men and women all over the world are on the march—physically, intellectually, spiritually." This condition is our opportunity. Holding fast to that which is good in our Western world, we should now seek a greater sympathy with and understanding of the Orient and Russia. We should now use the Free Mind Principle to show how all men in their diversity can find a unity of moral principle and intent in the will to a world of peace and justice. If we have the courage and the intellectual force, we can use our freedom to serve this end.

The breadth of the Free Mind Principle can open doors to fresh inspiration and wider opportunities of service. It can lift us from the dead level of conformity to a non-conformist wealth of viewpoints, to individual resourcefulness, and to skill in thinking and working together in freedom. Our position is thus affirmative, dynamic, outward-reaching, suited for the needs of free men living in a democratic world.

Educational Therapy

BETTY HIRSCH

When I traveled in the United States some fifteen years ago and lectured on the law for the employment of the heavily disabled, which had been introduced in 1920 in Germany, I was asked by the great oculist, Professor Knapp, in New York, to speak at the Academy of Medicine about "Educational Therapy" in cases of eye patients who would lose their sight sooner or later. As I had gathered many different experiences in hundreds of cases in this direction, I was glad to have the opportunity of speaking in a circle of experts about this most important matter, and I was much surprised and very happy to find much understanding from the audience, which consisted of oculists, authorities of schools, and commissions for the blind. As a matter of fact, they asked me for permission to publish my lecture in their monthly magazines and reports. Some months ago I found a notice in an American magazine, saying that they wanted to train several hundred men and women for the treatment of wounded and blinded men in the forces. I know this work is being done to perfection in all the great belligerent countries, but I have been asked so often these days what Educational Therapy means that I think it may be of general interest for non-experts to have it explained in simple words with a few examples. It will even perhaps be useful to some members of families whose son or husband may come home wounded or with the loss of a limb, sight, or hearing, and who does not need any hospital treatment and can easily be handled at home. Most men who lose a limb, their sight or hearing, in action think that their life is spoiled forever and lose courage to think of any future happiness; their mental sufferings often outweigh their bodily pains and handicaps. By such depressions their recovery is slowed down and may lead to constant melancholy. Therefore Educational Therapy is as essential as medical treatment.

To obtain the wanted success a doctor and an expert teacher must cooperate in every case. The doctor must decide when the physical condition of the patient has recovered far enough to begin the educational work, and how far this latter has to be exercised without disturbing a quick and perfect healing. The teacher must not only be a clever and imaginative expert of the particular faculty, but a first rank psychologist and endowed with a great deal of patience. In the case of lost limbs, an orthopedist will be a great help. The most difficult part of that work is that you cannot put up certain rules or methods, as each case must be treated individually. The wonderful research work of later years has resulted in such remarkable accomplishments of apparatus and methods that there will not be many cases of heavy disablement without one or the other kind of possibility to return to a useful life and independence. What this means to those patients only somebody can understand who has worked with them; and this mental recovery and inspiration is helping the healing of the worst wounds. The feeling of being dependent on his family, society, or state is the worst thing a man can suffer, and to be released from that feeling is to him like a new birth. So, Educational Therapy is not only teaching him to use in a practical way those limbs and strength which he has left, but also giving him a kind of security for his and his family's future and taking the bitter feeling of inferiority from him.

Now let me show you by a few examples how I myself, being blind, handled some difficult cases among many hundreds in the first war. One day a nurse came to my office at the hospital where I worked for the

war-blinded; she asked me if I would come up to a room where a young officer was in bed and nobody could get on with him. He was in despair, refusing to eat or to speak, and was lying there apathetically the whole day. Of course I went, and found the man as the nurse had said. I sat down at his bedside and began speaking of quite ordinary things: the weather, the food, his former profession, he had been a bank clerk, etc. Then I asked if he was comfortable or if he wished something done for him, whereupon he asked me for a glass of water. I rose, went to the table, knowing there was always a jug of water and a tumbler on the table, poured it out and gave it to him; he drank it and after a minute he suddenly asked me: "Why do you work with the blind comrades here in the house, as they tell me?" "Why?" I said in a very astonished voice. "Because I am blind myself." "That is not possible," he said, "you went to the table and brought me the glass." "Of course!" I replied, and now I began carefully to tell him that I and all the comrades worked and that he himself could take up his job again if he would learn reading and writing and so on. He was silent, but I felt that the ice was broken and went away with the conviction that I would soon see him in the classroom, and I was right. He not only got his job back, but studied for and took a Doctor's degree after a few years' time.

Shortly afterwards the same nurse came to me again and asked if she might bring a man to me who had entered the hospital, wringing his hands and with his hair actually stiffening on his head. He had been a schoolteacher at an elementary school and thought he would never be able to do any work again. He had two sons and a wife to keep, and everything was at an end. I asked him to stay for some hours in the classroom and inspect my teaching, not only of Braille, typing, and other devices for the use of the blind, but of science, etc. Then I asked him if he had noticed any difference in my teaching and his own. He answered, "No," and in a few days he was the most fervent pupil at the school. After he had left, prepared for his work, and was back at his job, I received an invitation to inspect his classes where he taught history, religion, and choir-singing, as of old.

But there are more complicated cases in which the ingenuity of the teacher is essential. One patient had lost both eyes and an arm up to the shoulder; he had been a motor van driver, but when he noticed the ability of his blinded comrades for typing, he immediately wanted to become a typist. Fortunately the typewriting teacher was a good mechanic, and set to work inventing a device for a one-hand typewriter with a special keyboard and a keyshift working by foot. In a year's time the patient was a typist and worked successfully at a big firm, competing with sighted fellow workers. I have given these few examples only to show what Educational Therapy means. If we think of the millions of military and civilian victims of our time, it is clear that this treatment is not only a blessing for the single individual, but will be a great help in the future predicament of human society.

For Dependable News
On International Affairs—

WORLDOVER PRESS

* Pierces the fog of confusion, distortion, propaganda, and suppression by getting behind conventional news gathering, superficial interpretation and snap judgments.
* Combines realistic treatment of grave problems with specific attention to constructive social achievements the world over.
* Clarifies conflicting reports of political developments in other countries through factual reporting and impartial analyses by an able staff of foreign correspondents, experts, and specialists.
* Maintains Latin American Office in Mexico for an incomparable coverage of Hemispheric progress and events, and in peacetime has an office on the European Continent, plus wide contacts in Asia.

Mailed to subscribers every week from October through June, and fortnightly July through September. Sample copies 10c. Annual Subscription $5.00.

Published in Wilton, Conn., U. S. A., WORLDOVER PRESS is a non-partisan, educational corporation, seeking to help create an informed public opinion on world affairs. Its sponsors are Americans distinguished in education, religion, science, economics, journalism, and international relations.

EDITORS

Devere Allen, Editor-in-Chief

Philip H. Gray, Jr., Executive Editor
Marie H. Allen, Associate Editor

Richard A. Kendrick, Managing Editor
Alice Barry, Editorial Secretary

Needed: An International Office for Education

CARL HERMANN VOSS

This second global war within a single generation teaches anew the need for collaboration by nations on a world-wide scale—an international collaboration in every field of human activity: organized religion, economic trade, military disarmament, political organization, and education. The need for cooperation in *all* spheres is vital, but the necessity for a dynamic unification of objectives in the field of education is of transcendent importance. It is as essential as the relief and rehabilitation of UNRRA, the law and order of AMG.

We need immediate action by the United Nations on the question of education, for the present world crisis demands such action. *The time is now.* Our program for the peace will be incomplete, in fact utterly futile, unless the nations plan an International Office for Education as part of the peace settlements which are under way at this present hour.

An International Office for Education with a permanent secretariat located in the future "world capital," should be organized for creative purposes, not for a cramping, didactic pedantry. Such an office would not dictate a curriculum for the three R's in any country but would *guard* and *guide* man's quest for knowledge —*guard* the heritage of the worthful, durable elements in the heritage of Western civilization as well as in the age-old culture of the Orient; and *guide* the educational systems of all the nations to achieve a unity, but not uniformity, of purpose.

Such an institution would develop a program of "democracy in education":

1. *Equality of opportunity* for all people in every land—a basic tenet in democracy;
2. *A campaign to banish ignorance and illiteracy,* two great obstacles to any nation in the realization of the freedom and liberty implicit in the democratic hope;
3. *The inculcation of a sense of dignity*—a prime factor in the democratic idea.

Achievement of these fundamental theses in democracy would be aided by an International Office for Education.

With such purposes in mind, the work of an International Office for Education, augmented by the other agencies in the growing international government of the United Nations, would offer a program to every nation, not just to the chosen few. The International Office for Education would encourage education from the pre-school period into adulthood, from nursery schools and kindergarten through elementary grades, high school, and college, into constructive adult education projects with their vocational and technical training, their public libraries and community forums.

Such a prospectus on an international scale would certainly not provide an educational utopia. It could, however, forge a bill of Educational Rights by which men and women might earn a livelihood, accept individual and community responsibilities, and gain strength and grace, confidence and direction, to participate actively in the building of a world which could progressively be freed from the twin evils of war and want. The International Office for Education would try to:

1. *Rebuild morale* among the peoples of the warring nations, both victor and vanquished;
2. *Aid in the reconstruction* of schools, colleges, and libraries in the devastated lands of Europe and Asia;
3. *Banish discrimination* on a basis of race color, or religion, and improve educational standards by substituting merit and ability as criteria for educational opportunity;
4. *Clarify educational aims* and thus avoid the authoritarian type of education which regiments development and stymies the creative impulse, which flourishes upon the lie, and which will perish only under the impact of truth;
5. *Encourage the interchange* of national ideals and cultures, and thereby create inter-nation comity;
6. *Facilitate the exchange of students* from one country to another to increase international understanding, gain perspective for growing minds, sharpen the skills of student leaders, and enrich the experience of both visitor and visited;
7. *Create a world-mindedness* as a counterbalance to a narrow national-mindedness which has been the bane of the modern era and is today so deeply imbedded in the minds of men throughout the world.

The main task on the agenda of an International Office for Education would be the re-education of the Nazi mind, not only in Germany, but also in Italy, Japan, the satellite and occupied countries, as well as in the nations of the free world, all of which have been poisoned to a greater or lesser degree for more than a decade by the Fascist menace. In the 1930's, educators of the democratic nations contended that Fascist programs of education were not their concern. For that sin of omission—the failure to kill Fascism at its very inception—we are paying bitterly today, and tomorrow there may be a greater penalty in a deluge of blood and tears. Hitlerism's ruthless brutality and unspeakable cruelty, its frightful superstitions and unholy lies, have fostered a resurgence of barbarism and neo-paganism, the like of which the civilized world has never known. An antidote must be prescribed to nullify the effect of these poisons. Otherwise our victory will be solely military and the job only half-done.

This process of decontamination can be handled only in part by the victor nations, who can go no further than a careful and sympathetic supervision of the educational systems in Germany and the other Axis nations. That is only a step in the procedure. The cure itself must be tactfully but firmly directed by democratically-minded nationals in Axis lands under the encouragement and guidance of an International Office for Education . These teachers, recruited from among returned exiles and leaders in the valiant underground movements, can administer an antidote for the polluted minds of their countrymen. Anti-Fascist instruction by the victor nations and democratic leadership by liberal elements of the vanquished nations will form the pattern of procedure.

This is a delicate and difficult job. But delicacy and difficulty should not deter the United Nations from essaying the task in a statesmanlike fashion. If it is not done, then Hitler will have won the war no matter how overwhelming the military defeat inflicted upon him. His crusade against civilization will have triumphed and the reign of unreason will flourish unchecked.

The forces of religion, like those of education, have a tremendous job to do,—*negatively,* in uprooting the foul growth of Fascism; and *positively,* in building anew for a free world. Organized religion will have its own task of reconstruction on a vast scale to restore ruined church buildings, reorganize disrupted congregations, educate a new ministry for the responsibilities of leader-

ship, enlarge relief institutions, re-establish mission schools and hospitals.

Religion will then engage in parallel action to that of the forces of education. In such a tandem, both religion and education must prevent a recurrence of the spiritual vacuum which is the curse of modern Europe —the spiritual vacuum into which history, abhorring a vacuum as does nature, pours its witches' brew of anti-Jewish agitation, anti-intellectualism, and sadistic hatreds. Religion and education point to the truth that "man does not live by bread alone," that treasures of mind and heart comprise the staff of life.

Religion, at its highest and best, calls for preservation of the most valuable in the past and the creation of the most worthful for the future. Education at its highest and best does no less.

Here, as in many other instances, religionists should join with educators in asking for the creation by the United Nations of an International Office for Education.

The Study Table

A Better World

THE ADVENTURES OF THE YOUNG SOLDIER IN SEARCH OF THE BETTER WORLD. *By C. E. M. Joad. New York: Arco Publishing Co. $2.00.*

THE PRACTICE OF IDEALISM. *By Alfred M. Bingham. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce. $2.00.*

Of all the 1944 crop of books on what Clare Booth Luce called "globaloney" these two are the most readable. They embrace an unbelievable variety of merits: learning, eloquence, racy but substantial style, brevity, the indescribably effective illustrations for Joad's sallies by Mervyn Peake, and—yes—inexpensiveness.

Whether in Bingham's Chapter II (making clear that this war is a complex revolution) or in Joad's scathing job on pat phrases, over-simplification, over-pessimism or over-optimism, you get a deflated dollar's worth. Joad is one of the ablest stylists in Britain and Bingham is one of the biggest hearts in the United States. What the two do for post-war thinking no other pair has done so well. Mystagogues and 99.9 per cent pure Marxists will not be soothed by the books, but others should be instructed and stimulated by them.

Probably the best, if negative, job in either book is Joad's demolishing attack on the Vansittarts and Rex Stouts, to which job Bingham adds the positive pitch: ". . . loving our enemies as brothers is not sentimentality but a practical requirement of the day of the airplane." While Joad smashes "the error of excessiveness" and the "all-or-none fallacy," Bingham soberly warns, "waging war is a lot easier than making peace"; and hurries on to demonstrate how a lasting peace can be had. "We can make this day now dawning the most glorious in man's long adventure."

These books will encourage you and give you fighting spirit. The aim of both is stated well in Joad's words: "You will throw yourself heart and soul into the task of making the better world, instead of merely looking for it."

ROBERT S. HOAGLAND.

A Significant Work

MEN OF LIBERTY. *By Stephen W. Fritchman. Boston: Beacon Press. 180 pp. $1.00.*

This book, written by the Editor of the *Christian Register,* is a modest volume. The author describes it as "little more than some footnotes on Unitarian biography." But it has great interest and real significance. What Mr. Fritchman has done is to take ten pioneers of liberal religion, and present their stories in the light of the age-old struggle for freedom of faith and worship. Freedom was never in so precarious a plight as at this moment, and it is good now to be reminded of brave men who were not afraid to suffer and in some cases to die for the truth within them. The book could not be more timely—nor more precious as witness and example for youthful readers, for whom it was primarily written.

Of his ten pioneers, nine are familiar. These are Servetus, Faustus Socinus, Francis David, John Biddle, Joseph Priestley, Thomas Jefferson, William Ellery Channing, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Theodore Parker. The tenth name is a surprise. It is that of Magnus Eiriksson (1806-1881), who did his great religious work in Iceland and Denmark, where he became "the most vilified minister in [these] two countries." He was called "the serpent's tongue," and of course "the anti-Christ." One has only to read the life story of this Icelandic preacher to understand how worthy is his enrollment in this great list of pioneers, most of them Unitarians and all of them in the Unitarian tradition.

Mr. Fritchman's brief biographies are simply and directly told. He burdens his tales with a minimum of theological discussion. He keeps to the story, the drama, of a great life, and illumines its meaning and value from the standpoint of the freedom which is his single theme. There is no particular distinction to be noted between these biographies, which average some fifteen pages in length. All are excellent. Not the least attractive feature of the book is the full-page illustrations by Hendrik Van Loon. These are in the best style of the man known among other things as the author of that splendid book, *Intolerance.* Fritchman and Van Loon are a great team!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Original Style

CHRISTIAN BEHAVIOR. *By C. S. Lewis. New York: The Macmillan Co. $1.00.*

Here is a slender volume containing twelve radio talks, originally delivered by Mr. Lewis over the B.B.C. to a British audience. He may be remembered as the author, also, of *The Screwtape Letters,* which attained popularity on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. Lewis is a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and a lecturer there on English literature. He addresses the radio audience as a layman and it may well be that the reason for his popularity on religious matters lies in this fact. Though an extreme fundamentalist in his point of view, Mr. Lewis is a master of words and his original style grips even those who do not agree with him.

HARRY TAYLOR.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

STILL GENEVA!!!

We are happy to announce that the Mid-West Unitarian Summer Assembly will still be held on Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. Arrangements have been made with College Camp to hold our combined Young People's and Adult Conferences there. Many advantages will be found in this change which was made necessary by the International Council of Religious Education scheduling another institute at Conference Point Camp.

College Camp is near our former location and is reached by the same means of transportation. Also, it is a recognized U.S. Post Office. Among the increased facilities which College Camp offers is a separate building for small children, with trained leaders to care for them during the morning and afternoon. There also is adequate space for lectures and workshops.

The costs for room and board will be somewhat higher than at our previous location. However, one can have the accommodations for which one is willing to pay, from a tent to a private suite with private bath.

Arrangements for the new conference location were made by a special committee appointed by the Board, consisting of Randall S. Hilton, Chairman; Mrs. Lou H. Haycock, G. Richard Kuch, and Ernest W. Kuebler.

GENEVA BOARD MEETING

The Board of the Lake Geneva Conference met on December 5 and 6 to plan the program for the 1945 Summer Conference. Randall S. Hilton was again elected Dean. G. Richard Kuch was elected Assistant Dean. Mr. Kuch is also Dean of the Young People's Conference. The program was outlined and the officers are now engaged in trying to secure the leaders for the various courses.

The success of the special committee in securing College Camp makes it possible to announce that the conference will be held the week of *AUGUST* 19 *to* 26.

The Board urges each church to start raising funds now to assist delegates to attend the conference. We should like to have every church in the Western Conference represented. Churches from other Conferences will also be represented. Watch for further announcements.

BRITISH UNITARIAN LEADER HERE

Rev. George Grieves, minister of the Unitarian Church of Highgate, London, and Director of the British Unitarian Service Committee, is in America, and made a flying trip through a portion of the Western Conference during December. He spoke at the Meadville Theological School, to the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, and to a Laymen's Luncheon in Chicago. Also on this trip he went to Winnipeg.

In his talk at the First Church, Chicago, he told of the Unitarian churches in wartime. Over half of the thirty Unitarian churches in Greater London have been seriously damaged by bombing. His own church has been bombed three times, yet by boarding up windows and using a tarpaulin for a roof, they still hold services there.

Originally, Mr. Grieves came solely to visit Unitarian organizations. However, since his arrival his stay has been prolonged so that he could undertake certain activities for the British Information Service.

WESTERN CONFERENCE BOARD

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference will hold its regular meeting in Chicago on Monday, February 5. Anyone desiring to present matters for the consideration of the Board should send such communications to the Secretary at once.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION

The Annual Meeting of the American Humanist Association will be held at the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, on February 26. Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, is the President. Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, minister of the Third Church, is Chairman of the Program Committee.

LIBERAL RELIGION ON THE AIR

The Western Conference office is desirous of knowing whether you have heard any of the broadcasts over Station WAIT (820). These are presented each Sunday afternoon—1:45 Central Time. If you have heard them, please notify the Conference Secretary. Your comments and suggestions will be appreciated.

KEOKUK

It was stated in the November News Notes that Keokuk was closed for the duration. Correction please: Monthly services are being held there under the leadership of Rev. Robert Murray Pratt, of Quincy.

UNITARIAN ADVANCE

We had hoped that by this time every church would have received a copy of the statement issued by Committee "A" and which was accepted by the Board of the American Unitarian Association as a description of the current Unitarian position for the purpose of carrying out an Advance program. However, to date only the ministers have received it. A more democratic distribution should be forthcoming soon.

Did you read "About Unitarian Advance" by John Malick, minister of our church in Duluth, in the December issue of UNITY? Events which have taken place since it was written highlight it even more. Our Universalist friends have been denied admission into the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The Federal Council has also issued a statement on "The Relation of the Church to the War in the Light of the Christian Faith," which is hopelessly orthodox and rooted in dogmatism.

The challenge to Unitarians to again fulfill their traditional role of carrying universal religious principles beyond the limitations of ecclesiastical Christianity now faces us from both within and without. As to whether we will have the vision and the courage to meet this challenge depends upon the insight and daring of each of us and of our leaders.

REMEMBER THE LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE—AUGUST 19-26, 1945